Remarks

Claims 1, 4-9 and 12-16 stand rejected following the Office Action of May 20, 2009.

A.   Rejection of claims 1, 4-9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-9 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 7,177,637, issued to Liu et al. (hereinafter, "Liu"), in view of U.S. Patent 6,792,474, issued to Hopprich et al. (hereinafter, " Hopprich ").

Liu teaches a method for permitting non-authorized wireless mobile devices to access public domain services in a local area network, e.g., see Liu's Abstract.

The Examiner acknowledged (on p.3, Office Action) that Liu does not teach the features of determining at the wireless access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest, the determining including examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain.

Thus, Hopprich's col. 23, lines 17-28 was cited as allegedly teaching the above features. The Office Action further stated that it would have been obvious to modify the device in Liu to include the missing features, because "the access point in Liu can be modified to examine user domains as taught in Hopprich and domain names are an efficient method of providing network access to local and guest users taught in Lui" (p.3-4, Office Action).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that there is no motivation to combine the teaching of Liu and Hopprich in the manner suggested in the Office Action, and even if combined, Liu and Hopprich would not have resulted in Applicants' claimed invention.

Hopprich is directed towards a method of assigning addresses in a network by an address server such as a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) server. (See Hopprich, Abstract.) Specifically, the cited portion of Hopprich (col. 23, lines 17-28) teaches a method for ascertaining the identity of a guest computer system 110 to ensure that it is not an imposter. In a request for address assignment, the guest computer system transmits a doubly encrypted domain name using the guest system's private key and the address server's public key. If, after decryption, the domain name is found to be valid (e.g., readable), i.e., a remote or local domain that is reachable within networks 102, 104 or 106; the address server can be sure that the message did not come from an impostering system.

Thus, Hopprich's teaching of using double-encryption to ensure the authenticity of the computer system requesting a network address assignment, is directed towards a totally different problem compared to that addressed in Liu. As such, there is no logical basis for combining Liu and Hopprich in the manner stated in the Office Action.

In the absence of any teaching in Liu or Hopprich of using the domain name for determining whether an access request came from a local user or guest, the Office Action's assertion (on p.4, Office Action) that Liu "can be modified to examine user domains as taught in Hopprich and domain names are an efficient method of providing network access to local and guest users taught in Liu" represents merely a conclusion based on impermissible hindsight.

In Hopprich, the successful decryption of the doubly-encrypted domain name is used solely to ensure that the message sender is not an imposter. Furthermore, the criterion for ascertaining validity, i.e., having a readable domain name, and being reachable within different networks such as local domain 102, other domains such as internet 104, and remote network domain 106 (Hopprich, col. 23, lines 24-29), does not provide a basis for distinguishing between a guest versus a local user domain.

Since there is no showing as to how Hopprich's teaching of validating a domain using a doubly-encrypted domain name would translate to: *"determining at the wireless network access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest, said determining including examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain;"* as provided in claim 1, Applicants submit that Hopprich fails to teach the above features that are missing in Liu.

Thus, even if combined, Liu and Hopprich still would not have resulted in Applicants' claim 1. As such, claim 1 is patentable over the combined teaching of Liu and Hopprich.

Independent claim 9 also recites features similar to that of claim 1, including "said access point determining whether the access request was received from a local user or a guest by examining if a user domain received with the access request indicates a guest domain." For the same reason set forth above, claim 9 is also patentable over the teaching of Liu and Hopprich.

Since claims 4-8 depend from claim 1, and claim 12 depends from claim 9, these dependent claims are also patentable over Liu and Hopprich for the same reason set forth above.

B. **Rejection of claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 13-16 stand rejected as being obvious over Liu, Hopprich and further in view of U.S. published application 2002/0157090A1 of Anton, Jr. (hereinafter, "Anton").

In rejecting claims 13-16, the Office Action cited various paragraphs of Anton as allegedly teaching the respective features in dependent claims 13-16.

Without conceding whether Anton's cited portions properly teach the features of claims 13-16 as asserted in the Office Action, Applicants submit that there is no showing that Anton remedies the deficiencies in Liu and Hopprich, as discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 9. Thus, Liu, Hopprich and Anton, even if combined, still would not have resulted in Applicant's claims 1 and 9.

Since claims 13-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 or claim 9, these claims are also patentable over Liu, Hopprich and Anton, for the same reasons set forth above.

<div align="center">

Conclusion

</div>

In view of the foregoing remark, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the claims. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6834, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Junbiao Zhang et al.

September 21, 2009
Date

/Wan Yee Cheung/
Wan Yee Cheung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,410
Phone: 609-734-6834

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312